

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/816,680	04/02/2004	Michael N. Helmus	ECV-5587CON	9711	
30452	7590 11/15/2004		EXAMINER		
	S LIFESCIENCES COF	AZPURU, CARLOS A			
ONE EDWA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER :		
•			1615		
			DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10/816,680		HELMUS ET AL.				
C	office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Carlos A. Azı		1615				
The Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication apoly	ppears on the co	over sheet with the co	orrespondence ad	dress			
THE MAIL. - Extensions of after SIX (6) - If the period - If NO period - Failure to rey Any reply rev	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a refor reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periodly within the set or extended period for reply will, by statucived by the Office later than three months after the mail at term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1. 1.136(a). In no event, pply within the statutor d will apply and will exute, cause the applicat	however, may a reply be time y minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from to ion to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timeline mailing date of this considered to the mailing date of the considered timeline mailing date of the considered to the considered timeline timeline to the considered timeline				
Status								
1)∐ Resp	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a) This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)☐ Since) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
close	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of	f Claims		et en					
4a) C 5)☐ Clair 6)⊠ Clair 7)☐ Clair	n(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdren(s) is/are withdren(s) is/are allowed. n(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are rejected. n(s) is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consi						
Application Page 1	apers	5						
9)∏ The s	pecification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	acement drawing sheet(s) including the corre eath or declaration is objected to by the E							
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	by Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documer Certified copies of the priority documer Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea e attached detailed Office action for a lis	nts have been r nts have been r iority documents au (PCT Rule 1	eceived. eceived in Applicatio s have been received 7.2(a)).	n No d in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
	eferences Cited (PTO-892)	4)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
3) X Information	aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 /Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Pa Other:		D-152)			

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the information disclosure statement filed 04/02/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

While it is acknowledged that applicant obtained promising results during the experimental phase of this application, it must be questioned why 2/3 of the dogs used in this treatment protocol died. Further, while the conditions of the experimental analysis may be somewhat different from those encountered by normal patients, the question must be raised as to whether applicant has

Art Unit: 1615

sufficiently enabled the claimed treatment when most of the "treated" population dies.

The two pertinent Wands factors which should be analyzed are:

- 2) The state of the prior art. Prior art use of the bioactive agents claimed in the application have been used separately in other treatment methods. Therefore it is established that they may produce some efficacy.
- 4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art. Since factor 2 establishes the use of these agents separately, it is then questioned whether the claimed combination is causing the death of 2/3 of the treated dogs.

Clarification is requested.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 24, 31, 33, 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite in the listing of the two members of the Markush Group set out as "synthetic polymers" and "synthetically modified polymers".

Specifically, it is not apparent how these two terms differ. It appears however, that applicant intended to set out "synthetically modified **natural** polymers", as

Art Unit: 1615

described in the specification at page 22, line 21. Clarification and correction is requested.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-66 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,313 (US'313). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because US'313 claims a method of preventing or reducing intimal hyperplasia by contacting the exterior surface of the internal structure with a delivery vehicle comprising an intimal hyperplasia preventing agent, said drug delivery vehicle being substantially flowable during application to said exterior surface and substantially adheres to said exterior surface of said internal structure (see claim 1 of US '313). The same polymers, dosage delivery forms and routes of administration are all set out in

Art Unit: 1615

the claims, and include microparticulate forms. Those of ordinary skill would therefore have expected similar therapeutic reduction of hyperplasia from the instant claims given the claims of US'313. The instant method of preventing or reducing intimal hyperplasia would have been obvious given the claims of US'313 which set out a similar method using the same materials and routes of administration.

Roth is cited as a patent of interest its disclosure of treating atherosclerosis. There is no teaching of administering multiple antiproliferative agents with different release rates in a controlled drug delivery system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos A. Azpuru whose telephone number is (571) 272-0588. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-Fri, 6:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent-Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ca

CARLOS A AZPURU

RIMARY EXAMINER